

**ORIGINAL**

**RECEIVED**

Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**MAY 3 1996**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY**

In the Matter of )

Policy and Rules Concerning the )  
Interstate, Interexchange Marketplace )

Implementation of Section 254(g) of the )  
Communications Act of 1934, as amended )

CC Docket No. 96-61

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

**REPLY COMMENTS OF LDDS WORLDCOM**

Catherine R. Sloan  
Richard L. Fruchterman  
Richard S. Whitt

WORLDCOM, INC.  
d/b/a LDDS WorldCom  
1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 776-1550

Its Attorneys

May 3, 1996

No. of Copies rec'd 0211  
List ABCDE

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
SUMMARY	i
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. INITIAL COMMENTS SUPPORT THE ADOPTION OF MORE SHARPLY FOCUSED DEFINITIONS OF RELEVANT PRODUCT AND GEOGRAPHIC MARKETS FOR FUTURE MARKET POWER ANALYSES	2
III. INITIAL COMMENTS BY NON-LECS OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORT COMPREHENSIVE SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS AS A NECESSARY CONDITION FOR THE BELL OPERATING COMPANIES TO PROVIDE OUT-OF-REGION INTERSTATE, INTEREXCHANGE SERVICES ON A NONDOMINANT BASIS	5
IV. COMMENTERS GENERALLY SUPPORT THE COMMISSION'S PROPOSED RULES TO IMPLEMENT THE NEW ACT'S RATE AVERAGING AND RATE INTEGRATION REQUIREMENTS	10
V. CONCLUSION	14

## **SUMMARY**

Most commenters join LDDS WorldCom in supporting the Commission's proposal to give greater precision to its definitions of relevant product and geographic markets for purposes of analyzing RBOC market power in the long distance market. In particular, commenters agree that the "special circumstances" of potential RBOC entry into the long distance market will require narrower definitions to better identify and measure the extent of RBOC market power. While a few commenters criticize the Commission's tentative approach as too generic or unfocused, LDDS WorldCom believes that the Commission's proposed revisions to its definitions will give it the necessary flexibility to consider many pertinent competitive factors. Because the RBOCs' control over exchange and access facilities will be the critical issue facing the Commission when confronted with the RBOCs' Section 271 applications, the Commission should ignore their self-serving criticisms of its proposed approach.

The vast majority of commenters, including state public service commissions and competitive telecommunications service providers, support retaining structural separation requirements on the RBOCs as a condition for their provision of out-of-region interLATA services on a nondominant basis. Commenters describe the RBOCs' ability and incentive to exercise their market power in the out-of-region interLATA market, and how structural separation is necessary to limit the RBOCs' ability to exercise of that power in anticompetitive and discriminatory ways. For this reason, a number of commenters join LDDS WorldCom in arguing that even stricter separation safeguards should be imposed on the RBOCs than are proposed. Parties also point out the compelling need for a separate subsidiary requirement in order to assist the Commission in carrying out the 1996 Act's dictates against RBOC cross-subsidies or discrimination, as well as to better protect consumers and competition in this

extended transition period before any local competition has begun to develop. Finally, many parties question why the Commission is using its scarce resources to revisit this issue so soon after raising it initially in the RBOC Out-of-Region proceeding.

In contrast, the RBOCs offer very little in new arguments that have not already been refuted by other parties in the RBOC Out-of-Region proceeding. Although most of the RBOCs claim that a separate subsidiary requirement for out-of-region services is inconsistent with the 1996 Act, LDDS WorldCom and others already explained in the RBOC Out-of-Region proceeding that the 1996 Act does not prohibit the Commission from imposing a separate subsidiary safeguard as a precondition to nondominant regulatory status. Several RBOCs also try to argue that their bottleneck control over local markets has been quickly disappearing merely because of passage of the 1996 Act, and that the supposedly burdensome structural separation requirements should be imposed on new entrants as well. LDDS WorldCom points out yet again what Congress and the Commission have clearly recognized many times over: the RBOCs possess monopoly control over essential local access and exchange facilities. The RBOCs simply cannot hide from the compelling fact of their overwhelming market power, or somehow try to equate their entrenched monopolies with vigorous competition.

The initial comments also offer general support for the Commission's proposed rate averaging and rate integration policies. Many commenters note that the 1996 Act directs the Commission to only codify its existing policies, which already reflect a marked degree of flexibility. In particular, many parties ask that the Commission clarify that certain types of service offerings now allowed by the Commission, including customer-specific contracts and contract tariffs, optional calling plans, and promotional plans, do not violate the Act's rate

averaging and integration requirements. LDDS WorldCom endorses these clarifications because they are wholly consistent with the Commission's current sensible, flexible approach to rate averaging and rate integration. Parties also demonstrate that competitive conditions warrant FCC forbearance, especially where nationwide IXC's are attempting to compete with regional IXC's in low-cost areas, because rate averaging and integration requirements should not needlessly impede the progress of competition. Although LDDS WorldCom does not oppose using self-certification as a means of enforcing the rate averaging and integration rules, the Commission is without authority to assess criminal penalties for any perceived violations of the policies. If the Commission does adopt the certification method, it should be incorporated into one of the Commission's existing forms in order to minimize the regulatory burden on carriers.

Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Policy and Rules Concerning the	)	CC Docket No. 96-61
Interstate, Interexchange Marketplace	)	
	)	
Implementation of Section 254(g) of the	)	
Communications Act of 1934, as amended	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS OF LDDS WORLDCOM**

WorldCom, Inc., d/b/a LDDS WorldCom ("LDDS WorldCom"), hereby files its reply comments in response to initial comments filed on April 19, 1996 regarding Sections IV, V, and VI of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("Notice"), FCC 96-123, released by the Commission on March 25, 1996 in the above-referenced proceeding.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

LDDS WorldCom filed initial comments in this proceeding on April 19.<sup>1</sup> Those comments favored the Commission's proposed adoption of more targeted definitions of relevant product market and relevant geographic market for purposes of analyzing the market power of the Regional Bell Operating Companies ("RBOCs") when they enter the interLATA market as interexchange carriers ("IXCs").<sup>2</sup> LDDS WorldCom's comments also strongly supported the retention of a strengthened separate subsidiary requirement to be imposed on the RBOCs to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Comments of LDDS WorldCom, CC Docket No. 96-61, filed April 19, 1996 ("LDDS WorldCom Comments").

<sup>2</sup> LDDS WorldCom Comments at 2-7.

extent they seek to provide out-of-region interLATA services on a nondominant basis.<sup>3</sup> Finally, LDDS WorldCom agreed with the Commission's proposed codification of its existing rate averaging and rate integration rules, provided IXC's are given enough flexibility to continue to provide a number of existing service offerings and to implement competitive responses based on "special circumstances" in the long distance market.<sup>4</sup>

Over thirty parties filed initial comments in this proceeding. Based on a review of those comments, the record clearly supports the positions articulated in LDDS WorldCom's original comments.

## **II. INITIAL COMMENTS SUPPORT THE ADOPTION OF MORE SHARPLY FOCUSED DEFINITIONS OF RELEVANT PRODUCT AND GEOGRAPHIC MARKETS FOR FUTURE MARKET POWER ANALYSES**

Most commenters join LDDS WorldCom in supporting the Commission's proposal to give greater precision to its definitions of relevant product and geographic markets for purposes of analyzing RBOC market power in the long distance market.<sup>5</sup> A number of commenters specifically support the use of the DOJ/FTC Guidelines.<sup>6</sup> Commenters also agree that the interstate, interexchange services market generally is one geographic and product market

---

<sup>3</sup> LDDS WorldCom Comments at 7-11.

<sup>4</sup> LDDS WorldCom Comments at 11-15.

<sup>5</sup> MCI Comments at 5-6, Sprint Comments at 4-7, TRA Comments at 31-32, ACTA Comments at 1, Florida PSC Comments at 8, Penn. PUC Comments at 10, USTA Comments at 13, Ameritech Comments at 13-14, Bell Atlantic Comments at 5, GTE Comments at 3-6.

<sup>6</sup> TRA Comments at 31, Penn. PUC Comments at 5, Ameritech Comments at 13-14.

at present,<sup>7</sup> but that "special circumstances" will require narrower definitions of the relevant geographic market as the RBOCs begin to enter the long distance market.<sup>8</sup>

A few commenters criticize the Commission's proposed reliance on the DOJ/FTC Guidelines as too generic to apply to the telecommunications industry. For example, MFS asks the Commission to use a "pragmatic market power test" instead which focuses on essential services purchased from competitors, market segmentation, and the potential for non-pricing anticompetitive actions.<sup>9</sup> The Pennsylvania PUC makes similar suggestions for a "more common sense approach" that takes into account a range of factors to meet the "credible evidence" standard enunciated in the Notice.<sup>10</sup> LDDS WorldCom agrees with these suggested approaches, but believes that the Commission's proposed revisions to its definitions of relevant product market and geographic market will give it the necessary leeway to consider the same pertinent factors. The point is, as GTE states, not to set the market structure in stone, but rather to give the Commission the necessary analytical tools and flexibility to assess the realities of market power when such an assessment is required.<sup>11</sup>

In a similar vein, several commenters argue over the reach of the Commission's proposed approach. AT&T and GSA insist, for example, that the Commission's proposed approach is not entirely relevant because, in AT&T's words, "the focal point in future Section

---

<sup>7</sup> AT&T Comments at 14-23, Sprint Comments at 4, Florida PSC Comments at 7-8.

<sup>8</sup> Sprint Comments at 5, Frontier Comments at 5-6, GCI Comments at 4.

<sup>9</sup> MFS Comments at 5-7.

<sup>10</sup> Penn. PUC Comments at 7.

<sup>11</sup> GTE Comments at 3-6.



271 applications will not be the definition of the interexchange market, but the extent to which a BOC has lost its monopoly power in local exchange and exchange access services."<sup>12</sup> LDDS WorldCom agrees that the RBOCs' control over exchange and access facilities will be the primary focus in future FCC proceedings to consider their Section 271 applications. At the same time, however, one cannot overlook what LDDS WorldCom refers to in its comments as the "critical and inextricable link between market power in the local exchange and access markets, and market power in the long distance market."<sup>13</sup> The Commission's proposed approach, although it focuses on the long distance market, inevitably must consider the effects of the RBOCs' market power in the adjacent local exchange and access markets as well.

On the other hand, a number of RBOCs criticize the Commission for even proposing any changes to the current market definitions in order to address the RBOCs' local market power.<sup>14</sup> Contrary to these tired claims, however, RBOC market power in the long distance market obviously will be the critical issue before the Commission when confronted with RBOC applications to enter the in-region long distance market. Several commenters, including LDDS WorldCom, describe in their initial comments how this RBOC market power can manifest

---

<sup>12</sup> AT&T Comments at 8; see also GSA Comments at 2.

<sup>13</sup> LDDS WorldCom Comments at 9.

<sup>14</sup> PacTel Comments at 5, Bell Atlantic Comments at 6, NYNEX Comments at 5-7, SBC Comments at 4, BellSouth Comments at 15-20, US West Comments at 3-10. A number of the RBOCs also claim that the FCC's price cap rules somehow constrain current access charge levels and otherwise moot concerns about RBOC control of access facilities. BellSouth Comments at 21, NYNEX Comments at 7, PacTel Comments at 7-8. These same arguments were repeated by the RBOCs in CC Docket No. 96-21, and are no more true here than they were there.

itself in the long distance market.<sup>15</sup> The purpose of adopting a new market power analysis is to allow the Commission to examine more carefully and completely the RBOCs' local bottleneck control to determine how competition is being, or will be, affected by RBOC entry into the long distance market. With this flexibility, the Commission will be able to ignore the mere "pinpoints of competition" that may begin to emerge,<sup>16</sup> and focus on the true extent of the RBOCs' market power in the local exchange that translates directly into market power in the local access and long distance markets.

### **III. INITIAL COMMENTS BY NON-LECS OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORT COMPREHENSIVE SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS AS A NECESSARY CONDITION FOR THE BELL OPERATING COMPANIES TO PROVIDE OUT-OF-REGION INTERSTATE, INTEREXCHANGE SERVICES ON A NONDOMINANT BASIS**

---

A truly impressive list of commenters, including state public service commissions,<sup>17</sup> and competitive telecommunications service providers,<sup>18</sup> support retaining structural separation requirements on the RBOCs as a condition for their provision of out-of-region interLATA services on a nondominant basis. In fact, only one non-LEC joins the RBOCs

---

<sup>15</sup> LDDS WorldCom Comments at 9-10, MCI Comments at 7, AT&T Comments at 9-14, Frontier Comments at 4.

<sup>16</sup> See Iowa UB Comments at 4.

<sup>17</sup> Washington UTC Comments at 2-3, Ohio PUC Comments at 3-4, Alabama PSC Comments at 6-7, Ohio CC Comments at 3, Missouri PSC Comments at 4, Penn. PUC Comments at 13-14.

<sup>18</sup> CompTel Comments at 3-5, MCI Comments at 25-26, AT&T Comments at 24-27, Sprint Comments at 24-27, Cable & Wireless Comments at 8, Frontier Comments at 7-8, TRA Comments at 7-24, ACTA Comments at 7, GCI Comments at 4-6, MFS Comments at 8, GSA Comments at 4-5, Vanguard Cellular Comments at 3.

in arguing that structural separation should not be required.<sup>19</sup> The sheer numbers of commenters weighing in on the side of structural separation lends considerable weight to its retention.

The compelling public interest reasons offered for structural separation, however, are even more persuasive than the overwhelming numbers in support. Commenters describe the RBOCs' ability and incentive to exercise their market power in the out-of-region interLATA market, and how structural separation is necessary to limit the RBOCs' ability to exercise that power in anticompetitive and discriminatory ways.<sup>20</sup> One state regulator explains that removing the separation requirement would make it much harder for the states to prevent cross-subsidies.<sup>21</sup> A number of commenters join LDDS WorldCom in arguing that stricter separation safeguards should be imposed on the RBOCs than are required currently for independent LECs, in order to better protect consumers and competition.<sup>22</sup> In fact, a separate subsidiary requirement is even more necessary now in order to assist the Commission in carrying out the 1996 Act's dictates against RBOC cross-subsidies or discrimination,<sup>23</sup> and to protect consumers and competition in this initial extended period of uncertainty and transition before any local

---

<sup>19</sup> Florida PSC Comments at 12-13.

<sup>20</sup> AT&T Comments at 24-26, TRA Comments at 7-19, MCI Comments at 10, GSA Comments at 3, Wash. UTC Comments at 2-3.

<sup>21</sup> Wash. UTC Comments at 3.

<sup>22</sup> LDDS WorldCom Comments at 10-11, CompTel Comments at 4-5, AT&T Comments at 27, TRA Comments at 21-24, Ohio PUC Comments at 3-4.

<sup>23</sup> Alabama PSC Comments at 6-7.

competition has begun to develop.<sup>24</sup>

Many parties also question why the Commission is revisiting this very issue so soon after raising it initially in the RBOC Out-of-Region proceeding.<sup>25</sup> It appears a questionable use of the Commission's scarce resources to consider reversing its tentative conclusion favoring separation in that proceeding even while, as one commenter puts it, "the ink is barely dry" on the comments filed there.<sup>26</sup> In implicit recognition of this fact, the RBOCs repeatedly refer the Commission to their arguments in CC Docket No. 96-21, while Bell Atlantic and US West, like LDDS WorldCom, actually append copies of their comments in that proceeding.

The RBOCs offer very little in new arguments that have not already been soundly refuted in the RBOC Out-of-Region proceeding. For example, most of the RBOCs claim (once again) that a separate subsidiary requirement for out-of-region services is prohibited by, or otherwise "inconsistent with," the 1996 Act.<sup>27</sup> In CC Docket No. 96-21, however, LDDS WorldCom explained that the Commission's proposal nowhere requires that the RBOCs adopt a separate subsidiary to provide out-of-region interLATA services, so long as the FCC's dominant carrier rules are followed. Moreover, the new 1996 Act does not even suggest that

---

<sup>24</sup> Alabama PSC Comments at 7, Penn. PUC Comments at 13-14.

<sup>25</sup> CompTel Comments at 3, Cable & Wireless Comments at 8, Ohio CC Comments at 2. See In the Matter of Bell Operating Company Provision of Out-of-Region Interstate Interexchange Services, CC Docket No. 96-21, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 96-59, issued February 14, 1996.

<sup>26</sup> Cable & Wireless Comments at 8.

<sup>27</sup> Ameritech Comments at 10-11, Bell Atlantic Comments at 3, NYNEX Comments at 9-10, SBC Comments at 7, US West Comments at 10-11.

the Commission cannot impose a separate subsidiary safeguard as a precondition to nondominant regulatory status.<sup>28</sup> Just because the statute mandates the use of a separate subsidiary for certain in-region interLATA services, does not in any way imply that the statute prohibits the Commission from establishing a separate affiliate structure as a condition of nondominant regulation of out-of-region services.

Ameritech also asserts that the RBOCs' bottleneck control is "quickly dissipating" as a result of the 1996 Act, and that the Act ensures that "sustainable" competition will develop "quickly."<sup>29</sup> However, the Commission's cogent discussion in its recent Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 96-98 gives the lie to the inevitability of this overly rosy outcome.<sup>30</sup> There, the Commission states that the 1996 Act embodies the view that the local exchange may not be a natural monopoly, but that "the extent to which it can be proved in the marketplace depends on the capabilities of inventors, entrepreneurs, and financiers, as well as this Commission and its state counterparts."<sup>31</sup> The Commission recognizes that simply removing legal barriers to entry "is still not sufficient to enable competition to replace monopoly in the local exchange."<sup>32</sup> As a result, the Commission's primary role under the 1996 Act is in "permitting efficient competition to occur wherever possible, and replicating competitive

---

<sup>28</sup> Reply Comments of LDDS WorldCom, CC Docket No. 96-21, at 6-8.

<sup>29</sup> Ameritech Comments at 7, 8.

<sup>30</sup> Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 96-182, issued April 19, 1996.

<sup>31</sup> Id. at para. 5.

<sup>32</sup> Id. at para. 6.

outcomes where competition is infeasible or not yet in place."<sup>33</sup> A key tool to achieving these twin aims is to retain a separate subsidiary requirement on the RBOCs' provision of out-of-region interLATA services on a nondominant basis.

Along the same lines, Bell Atlantic bemoans the "burdensome and "asymmetric" separate subsidiary requirements placed on "new entrants" as opposed to the "nationwide cartel" of IXC's,<sup>34</sup> while PacTel lashes out at the "oligopoly" of long distance carriers and insists that a separate subsidiary requirement must also apply to all competing local carriers in order to create a "level playing field."<sup>35</sup> The RBOCs refuse to account for the Commission's finding that they possess monopoly control over access facilities,<sup>36</sup> while the long distance market is "characterized by substantial competition."<sup>37</sup> Even the most overused displays of rhetoric by the RBOCs cannot disguise their overwhelming market power, or somehow equate entrenched monopoly with vigorous competition.

Finally, the RBOCs' repeated claims of the "costs of separation" are also unsupported.<sup>38</sup> Interestingly, PacTel undermines those very arguments when it asserts that it will use the affiliate structure required by Section 272 of the 1996 Act for in-region interLATA

---

<sup>33</sup> Id. at para. 12.

<sup>34</sup> Bell Atlantic Comments at 2, 3.

<sup>35</sup> PacTel Comments at 2 n.4, 9.

<sup>36</sup> Notice at paras. 52-53.

<sup>37</sup> Notice at para. 2.

<sup>38</sup> Bell Atlantic Comments at 2-5, SBC Comments at 6-7.

services in order to provide its out-of-region services.<sup>39</sup> Sprint also directly contradicts the notion that the requirement brings any major costs to the RBOCs when it observes that the requirement has not been unduly burdensome on its local and long distance services.<sup>40</sup>

#### **IV. COMMENTERS GENERALLY SUPPORT THE COMMISSION'S PROPOSED RULES TO IMPLEMENT THE NEW ACT'S RATE AVERAGING AND RATE INTEGRATION REQUIREMENTS**

---

The initial comments also offer general support for the Commission's proposed rate averaging and rate integration policies. Many commenters note that the 1996 Act directs the Commission to only codify its existing rate averaging and rate integration policies,<sup>41</sup> and that its codified policies should reflect a marked degree of flexibility that exists in current practice.<sup>42</sup> In particular, many parties ask that the Commission clarify that certain types of services offerings now allowed by the Commission, including distance-sensitive rates,<sup>43</sup> customer-specific contracts and contract tariffs,<sup>44</sup> optional calling plans,<sup>45</sup> and promotional

---

<sup>39</sup> PacTel Comments at 9.

<sup>40</sup> Sprint Comments at 8.

<sup>41</sup> CompTel Comments at 6, AT&T Comments at 28, 31-32, Frontier Comments at 9, TRA Comments at 28-29, GCI Comments at 6-7.

<sup>42</sup> AT&T Comments at 28; Sprint Comments at 10-11, 14-15.

<sup>43</sup> CompTel Comments at 7.

<sup>44</sup> CompTel Comments at 7, AT&T Comments at 33, MCI Comments at 30-31, Frontier Comments at 9, TRA Comments at 29, GSA Comments at 8-9.

<sup>45</sup> CompTel Comments at 8, MCI Comments at 30-31, Frontier Comments at 9.

plans,<sup>46</sup> do not violate the rate averaging and integration requirements of the 1996 Act. Commenters also ask for clarification that IXC's should not be required to offer their services ubiquitously in all regions of the country,<sup>47</sup> and that every option in a package of services should not be required to be averaged.<sup>48</sup> LDDS WorldCom endorses these clarifications because they are wholly consistent with the Commission's current sensible, flexible approach to rate averaging and rate integration. Thus, the Commission should reject contrary calls from some parties who deem promotional or discount programs somehow as improper under the 1996 Act.<sup>49</sup> If such practices were actually barred by the rate averaging and rate integration provisions of the 1996 Act, the statute would have said so.<sup>50</sup>

In addition, parties demonstrate that competitive conditions warrant FCC forbearance. In particular, as LDDS WorldCom explains in its comments, forbearance is necessary where nationwide IXC's are attempting to compete with regional IXC's in low-cost areas.<sup>51</sup> Some commenters point out that, to minimize the competitive imbalance created by

---

<sup>46</sup> AT&T Comments at 33, MCI Comments at 35, Frontier Comments at 9, TRA Comments at 29.

<sup>47</sup> CompTel Comments at 8, Cable & Wireless Comments at 4.

<sup>48</sup> CompTel Comments at 9.

<sup>49</sup> Penn. PUC Comments at 16-18, State of Alaska Comments at 7, USTA Comments at 3, PacTel Comments at 11-12.

<sup>50</sup> Sprint also points out that LDDS WorldCom offers wholesale long distance services to its reseller customers on an unbundled, regional basis, and states that such a pro-competitive practice should be deemed acceptable under the 1996 Act. See Sprint Comments at 11-13. LDDS WorldCom agrees.

<sup>51</sup> LDDS WorldCom Comments at 14; see also MCI Comments at 29-30, AT&T Comments at 29-30, 34, 40-42, TRA Comments at 30, BellSouth Comments at 5-8.



national and regional carriers serving regions with different access charge prices, rate averaging logically should be "net of access."<sup>52</sup> Barring such a decision, AT&T urges that rate averaging not be ordered without the completion of comprehensive access charge reform first.<sup>53</sup> LDDS WorldCom agrees that rate averaging and integration requirements should not needlessly impede the progress of competition, and that access charges should not be part of the equation for determining rate averaging and integration. Regardless, AT&T is correct that access charge reform is urgently needed in order to bring all access charges to cost. Moreover, where carriers are able to compete directly with one another based on price and quality of service, ultimately all regions of the country will benefit. To that end, LDDS WorldCom believes that serious consideration should be given to a suggestion by some parties that the Commission should simply forbear from applying its rate averaging and integration policies to all nondominant IXC's.<sup>54</sup>

A number of parties agree with the Commission that a self-certification process should be used to enforce the rate averaging and integration rules.<sup>55</sup> Many other commenters do not necessarily oppose certifications, but point out that tariffs or price lists would provide a better enforcement mechanism.<sup>56</sup> Several parties believe that carrier certifications are not

---

<sup>52</sup> AT&T Comments at 30 n.56, MCI Comments at 28 n.42, ACTA Comments at 8-9. But see Penn PUC Comments at 16-18, Florida Comments at 14.

<sup>53</sup> AT&T Comments at 34-35.

<sup>54</sup> AT&T Comments at 39, Sprint Comments at 14, 25, Cable & Wireless Comments at 5 n.9.

<sup>55</sup> See, e.g., BellSouth Comments at 4-5, Frontier Comments at 9 n.27.

<sup>56</sup> MCI Comments at 33-34, ACTA Comments at 9-10, GCI Comments at 8, USTA Comments at 5, GTE Comments at 17-19, State of Alaska Comments at 5-6, Alabama PSC Comments at 8, Penn. OCA Comments at 6, Ohio CC Comments at 4-5, Rural Telephone Coalition Comments at 4-8.

necessary, and that the Commission should rely on the complaint process instead.<sup>57</sup> As indicated in its initial comments, LDDS WorldCom does not oppose using self-certification as a means of enforcing the rate averaging and integration rules.<sup>58</sup> However, LDDS WorldCom strongly disagrees with the suggestion that any violation of the certification process -- inadvertent or otherwise -- should result automatically in criminal penalties for perjury and retroactive damages.<sup>59</sup> Such an extreme approach would be entirely unwarranted for an industry that has generally complied with the FCC's current non-codified policies. Moreover, neither the Communications Act of 1934, nor the 1996 Act, provide for criminal penalties in the absence of willful intent. Finally, if the Commission decides to adopt the certification method, LDDS WorldCom agrees that it should be incorporated into one of the Commission's existing forms, such as those used for the TRS Fund, in order to minimize the regulatory burden on carriers.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> CompTel Comments at 9, C&W Comments at 7.

<sup>58</sup> LDDS WorldCom Comments at 14-15.

<sup>59</sup> Rural Telephone Coalition at 5.

<sup>60</sup> CompTel Comments at 9.

V. **CONCLUSION**

The Commission should act in accordance with the recommendations proposed above and in LDDS WorldCom's initial comments in this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. R. Sloan", written over a horizontal line.

Catherine R. Sloan  
Richard L. Fruchterman  
Richard S. Whitt

WORLDCOM, INC.  
d/b/a LDDS WorldCom  
1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 776-1550

Its Attorneys

May 3, 1996

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Cecelia Y. Johnson, hereby certify that I have this 3rd day of May, 1996, sent a copy of the foregoing "Comments of LDDS WorldCom" by hand delivery, or first class mail, postage prepaid, to the following:

William F. Caton (original and 11 copies)\*  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Room 222  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Regina Keeney\*  
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
Room 500  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Janice Myles (on computer disk w/ cover letter)\*  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
Room 554  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

International Transcription Service, Inc.\*  
2100 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 140  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Raul R. Rodriguez  
Stephen D. Baruch  
David S. Keir  
Leventhal, Senter & Lerman  
2000 K Street, N.W. - Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Donald J. Elardo  
Frank W. Krogh  
Mary J. Sisak  
MCI Communications Corp.  
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mark Rosenblum  
Leonard J. Cali  
Richard H. Rubin  
AT&T Corporation  
295 North Maple Avenue - Room 325213  
Basking Ridge, New Jersey 07920

Alan Kohler  
Veronica A. Smith  
John F. Povilaitis  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
P. O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-3265

Thomas K. Crowe  
Kathleen L. Greenan  
Law Offices of Thomas K. Crowe  
2300 M Street, N.W. - Room 800  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Phillip F. McClelland  
Irwin A. Popowsky  
Office of General Counsel  
Office of Consumer Advocate  
1425 Strawberry Square  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Robert S. Tongren  
Consumer's Counsel  
The Office of the Ohio Consumer's Counsel  
77 South High Street - 15th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0550

Sharon Nelson  
Richard Hemstad  
William R. Gillis  
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission  
1300 Evergreen Park Drive South  
Olympia, Washington 98504

Mary McDermott  
Linda Kent  
USTA  
1401 H Street, N.W. - Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005

James D. Ellis  
Robert M. Lynch  
David F. Brown  
SBC Communications, Inc.  
175 E. Houston - Room 1254  
San Antonio, Texas 78205

Joseph Di Bella  
Donald C. Rowe  
The NYNEX Telephone Companies  
1300 I Street, N.W. - Suite 400 West  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Betty D. Montgomery  
Steven T. Nourse  
Duane W. Luckey  
Public Utilities Section  
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
180 East Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793

Philip L. Verner  
Brian A. Finley  
Willkie Farr & Gallagher  
Three Lafayette Centre  
1155 21st Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert B. McKenna  
Coleen M. Egan Helmreich  
U.S. West, Inc.  
1020 19th Street, N.W. - Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Margaret L. Tobey, P.C.  
Phuong N. Pham, Esq.  
Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld  
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. - Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Charles P. Featherstun  
David G. Richards  
1133 21st Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Michael J. Shortley, III  
Attorney for Frontier Corp.  
180 South Clinton Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14646

Bruce D. Jacobs  
Glenn S. Richards  
Fisher Wayland Cooper Leader & Zaragoza L.L.P.  
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Lisa M. Zaina  
Stuart Polikoff  
21 Dupont Circle - Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Raymond G. Bender, Jr.  
J.G. Harrington  
Christopher Libertelli  
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson  
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. - Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Albert H. Kramer  
Robert F. Aldrich  
Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin, LLP  
2101 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-1526

C. Douglas Jarrett  
Susan M. Hafeli  
Brian Turner Ashby  
Keller and Heckman  
1001 G Street, N.W. - Suite 500 West  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Andrew D. Lipman  
Erin M. Reilly  
Swidler & Berlin, Chartered  
3000 K Street, N.W. - Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007

Leon Kestenbaum  
Kent T. Nakamura  
Sprint  
1850 M Street, N.W. - 11th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Paul Rodgers  
Charles D. Gray  
James Bradford Ramsay  
National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners  
1102 ICC Building  
P. O. Box 684  
Washington, D.C. 20044

John W. Katz, Esq.  
Special Counsel to the Governor  
Director, State-Federal Relations  
Office of the State of Alaska  
444 North Capitol Street, N.W. - Suite 336  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Herbert E. Marks  
Marc Berejka  
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey  
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
P. O. Box 407  
Washington, D.C. 20044

Danny E. Adams  
Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr.  
Kelley Drye & Warren  
1200 19th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Emily Hewitt  
General Counsel  
General Services Administration  
18th & F Streets, N.W. - Room 4002  
Washington, D.C. 20405

Susan Drombetta  
Manager, Rates and Tariffs  
Scherers Communications Group, Inc.  
575 Scherers Court  
Worthington, Ohio 43085



Margaret E. Garber  
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004

Gary L. Phillips  
Ameritech's Counsel  
1401 H Street, N.W. - Suite 1020  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Edward Shakin  
Bell Atlantic  
1320 North Court House Road - 8th Floor  
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Margot Smiley Humphrey  
Koteen & Naftalin, LLP  
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. - Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Chris Barron  
TCA, Inc.  
3617 Betty Drive - Suite I  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80917

Rodney L. Joyce  
Ginsburg, Feldman and Bress  
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Gail L. Polivy  
1850 M. Street, N.W. - Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Charles C. Hunter  
Hunter & Mow, P.C.  
1620 I Street, N.W. - Suite 701  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Charles H. Helein  
General Counsel  
Helein & Associates, P.C.  
8180 Greensboro Drive - Suite 700  
McLean, Virginia 22102